THEOLOGY

VOL. LXI APRIL, 1958 No. 454

Editorial

FOR Passiontide and Easter reading we recommend Brother George Every's little book, *Lamb to the Slaughter* (James Clarke and Co., 7s. 6d.). It contains five lectures which he gave at the Bishop's Hostel, Lincoln. They deal with the theme of Christ's sacrifice against the background both of the Bible and of the comparative study of religions, and also with regard to its enactment in the sacraments and liturgy of the Church. Sacrifice and sacrifices, which, as Brother Every says, were taken for granted by the ancients as part of any normal life, represent a strange and unfamiliar idea in our world, although the actual word is familiar enough. "Is it," he asks, "a psychological disease, a discarded stage in the development of agricultural science, or something rooted in the nature of things?" It might not occur to most Christians to frame the question thus, but interest in non-Christian parallels to the Christian story is widespread among inquirers. Books on the comparative study of religions are being published in abundance and they are read. They can lead to the dismissal of Christianity as just one of a class of mythological beliefs that are no longer credible. Brother Every rightly considers that this question should be taken more seriously than it is by most Christian apologists. So far from denying the parallels that exist, he emphasizes their reality, and maintains that a discriminating investigation of them has much to contribute to the way in which Christians should view the central mysteries and rites of their faith. If the idea of sacrifice in the traditional sense of the word is to be rehabilitated and to be seen to correspond to something universal and permanent in man's relation to God and to the world in which his life is set, it may well be done along some such lines as these.

* * * * *

The pocket of conservative evangelicals who have been opposing the proposed canon which recognizes the legality of the eucharistic vestments would have been better and more interestingly employed if instead they had pressed for an explicit recognition of the black gown as the appropriate vesture for preaching. Just as the special character of the eucharistic sacrament in the life of the Church is fittingly symbolized by its ministers' wearing vestments especially associated with that office, so the special character of preaching or of the ministry of the word should be expressed by the traditional vesture especially associated in the reformed churches with *that* office. We know several churches that were built as late as during the nineteenth century, in which the vestry was so constructed as to enable the preacher to change into a black gown on his way to the pulpit. If we are going to take these matters seriously, then the character of

the Church of England as both thoroughly Catholic and thoroughly reformed and as attaching equal importance to the ministry of the word and the sacraments is best brought out by its use of a distinct vesture for each, and not by the dull, mediocre and unimaginative use of the surplice, etc., for those offices as well as for the choir office to which it belongs. The evangelicals have made fools of themselves by abandoning the black gown at a time when those churchmen who aspire to be equally Catholic and reformed have been bringing it back into use.

Two Epitaphs

He "ordered his body here to expect a joyful resurrection". They are touching words when one knows the biography that lies behind them. For they come from the inscription on the monument in Hollingbourne church to an exile who had returned to his well-loved Kentish home close under the North Downs just in time to die there. John, Lord Culpeper, had fought at Edgehill and Newbury—the former battle is called Kineton on his monument, as it often was at the time from the place where the baggage of the Parliament had lain. He had shared the inner counsels of a threadbare hungry court, hoping against hope in continental garrets, while Cromwell yet exercised his mastery. His daughters, tradition tells, were embroidering an altar cloth, still at Hollingbourne church, in the nearby manor house against his return. Then home he came on that memorable 29 May, when the great ship *Naseby*, renamed the *Royal Charles*, arrived at Dover to the huzzas of the multitude, and on the following 11 July he died.

But the words are a great deal more than touching. They are typical of the structure of biblical faith which a new churchmanship could re-erect on the field cleared of sub-Christian lumber by the Reformation. Gone is the stock *Cuius animae propicietur Deus* of the later Middle Ages. That was redolent of the chantry. Not that Lord Culpeper and his friends have been left in any doubt of their need of a Saviour, but they know (devout in showing the Lord's death, till he come, that many of them were) that it is not by the strange aberration of financing a multiplicity of masses that they can be brought within the scope of his finished work. A humble faith has replaced that mechanism, and resurrection is now again the key word that it was in the New Testament. You meet it on the monuments of a singularly attractive piety, and the Church, which nurtured that piety, need not covet more spectacular sons and daughters than these, of whom it is written that it was in hope of resurrection that they died.

The emphasis on the body is notable. It is, of course, implicit in the resurrection hope but, now that an English Bible had declared for all to hear the decisiveness of the present life, Christian interest in complete men could chase away the medieval obsession with their souls in purgatory. The massive, and therefore supporting, Burial

Service in the Prayer Book concerns itself with the important business in hand, the laying aside of a Christian body to await the consummation of all things. Significantly it is in our own time one of the most maltreated of the Prayer Book services. For Lord Culpeper the Prayer Book expressed plainly what he believed, and it was surely good Prayer Book—yes, and good Bible and sound Christian —sentiment that he should desire his dust to claim its place in the new creation with his Hollingbourne. No theory of evolution had illuminated his kinship with his fellow-creatures, animate and inanimate, but neither had the word "spiritual" lost its Christian connotation of everything of whatever kind that is under the Holy Spirit and thus disconnected some ethereal Lord Culpeper from the material creation and its destiny in Christ.

Did he think of all this crudely? It is part of our arrogance that we suppose that forefathers who could talk poetry, as we can not, must have been more naive than we. But better that, and truer—better the crudest notions of some medieval Hodge looking up at the painting of Doomsday in the parish church—than an eclectic symbolism derived from quite other Graeco-Oriental sources than Christ's resurrection, and which, in rendering the body otiose, renders the Easter Alleluyas, by which we celebrate his victory in and for the body, unconvincing and otiose too. Maybe Lord Culpeper thought of the identity which is expressed in the word "resurrection" in physical terms that are not possible for us. Maybe he did not, for it is to be supposed that he was more familiar with the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians than the substitution for it at funerals of less relevant lessons, usually proleptic passages from the Book of the Revelation,[1] allows our generation to be. But in any case it was not in something called passing-on or an after-life or survival, none of them expressions suggestive of a "lively hope", that he and his friends believed, but in resurrection, nor did they think that the creation, which God saw was good, was so to be scrapped that it was only in this life that *Benedicite omnia opera* would be sung. Nor, indeed, were they lacking in that sense of the transitoriness of things seen which should give to the vastest and more storied cathedral something of the character of a prefabricated structure in which Christ's appearance is awaited. Nowadays in that particular setting it is an emphasis on continuance that is apt to contradict the New Testament. Consummation, not continuance, is the true Christian concern. But such consummation means renewal, not elimination, and behind the statement that he "ordered his body here to expect a joyful resurrection" lies a whole scheme of creation and salvation. It lingers still in our instincts and customs. It is not only to the mourners that we raise our hats as the funeral passes.

On the chancel wall that Lord Culpeper's monument adorns (and such monuments do adorn, as Mrs Esdaile has taught us again to

[1] Having made havoc of the New Testament meaning of the word "saint" and departmentalized the departed into categories of saints and souls unknown to Scripture, we then often proceed in choosing lessons and hymns to make confusion worse confounded by exalting everyone to the former category.

see) is another inscription with as notable a phrase. Young Dame Grace Gethin—she was but twenty-one years old when she died—was a remarkable person. At the dawn of the Age of Reason, when Tillotson was already the preacher to hear, she was seeing visions. One might be less surprised to meet such a devotée in the France of Louis XIV than in the England of William and Mary. but perhaps the type was less uncommon here than the compartments of the history books have led one to suppose. Certainly her eager desire for the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood was not exceptional, but it is some words at the end of the inscription, which records all this, that catch the eye. She "victoriously entered into rest". One might search far to match that as a description of a death-bed governed by the Christian hope.

Victory and rest—a striking combination! But again, the words will have sounded less contrasting to those who put them there than they are apt to sound to us. They had not forgotten the insistent use of the word "sleep" in the New Testament. Rest was for them a blessed thing really to be desired for the dead, as Christian tradition desires it. It was still that great thing that the Bible so impressively makes it, so that the Lord God could be seen, not surely by primitive anthropomorphism but by profound insight, resting from his six days' work. There is a theology of rest to be recovered. Our forefathers understood it. Thus it was not only because she could look on to resurrection to transfigured vitality at the last that Dame Grace could enter into rest victoriously. Into Sheol the True Light now shone, having broken its bondage. What happier interim prospect than to "sleep in Jesus"?

It is our over-busy age that must needs turn paradise into a hive of activity, for the rest, that we sometimes sigh for, has become, in fact, a thing thought of with disapproval and aversion. Thus the funeral preacher must coin such unscriptural phrases as "passed to the higher service". It is indeed significant how seldom the phrases of Scripture are to be heard in such orations. The wisdom of the Prayer Book provides no place for a preacher at the funeral, still less for an obituary notice spoken by some man of letters, business, war, or whatever was the avocation of the deceased. Yet the funeral sermon or address (that flimsy word bids fair to oust the substantial word "sermon" from our vocabulary) might make funerals occasions of no less opportunity than weddings have become, now that we have stopped whispering to the bride and bridegroom. Alas, when, as rarely happens, more than justifying reminiscences are to be heard at funerals, it is too often only that what is said in the prayers that are allowed to remain from the Prayer Book may be heedlessly contradicted. In such a flight of fancy was one told by lips, which had just prayed that "we may rest in him, as our hope is this our brother doth", that at death we should become, horrid thought, immeasurably more active than in the hectic round from which a tired-out fellow-clergyman had just departed.

It is this worship of activity, not deference to the timeless eternity of the philosophers, that has made the Bible program of rest and age

to become an embarrassment. Nevertheless, we may be deeply grateful to Prof. Cullmann for boldly questioning our concern with timeless eternity, and rendering that program theologically respectable again. Certain it is that the Bible, with seldom a side-glance at Hellas, presents us with a sequence of rest and resurrection, that gracious rest which, whatever its duration, Dame Grace in a less entirely Martha age could embrace without repining.

Not that the seventeenth century has been "half in love with easeful death" or "called him soft names". "But from this earth, this grave, this dust, my God shall raise me up, I trust", Raleigh had written, but first he had packed into lines which begin, "Even such is Time", all death's remorselessness. The macabre symbols of mortality on seventeenth-century monuments are, like the shroud effigies for which Donne set a small short-lived fashion, in the tradition of the fifteenth-century bishop lying in all his glory on his tomb with his cadaver below. Lachrymose cherubs can attend the most Christian inscriptions, for death is the enemy, and "Jesus wept". Indeed, the stark quality of death must have been more publicly apparent at a time when the wound corpses of all but the rich were, as the Prayer Book rubric puts it, "made ready to be laid in the earth", unshielded by the devices of modern undertaking. Perhaps the deep (and, it can be, tender) meaning of "earth to earth" was the more naturally sensed for that. But here was none of that light-heartedness that is sometimes nowadays recommended and professed, as being Christian, in the face of the grim sequel to the entry of sin into the world. Rather, to face the facts squarely was more thankfully to expect the pleasure of a rest that, now in Christ, could be entered into victoriously, a resurrection that in him could be awaited in association with a part of God's creation that one loved.

It was not the eighteenth century that threw all this away. Certainly both pride of lineage and newly acquired affluence could dwarf the Lord's Table with a monument. That could already be done in the reign of Elizabeth I,[1] and the nineteenth century has removed many such giants to more discreet corners of our churches. Certainly your magnate could very commonly be commemorated by an inscription which did nothing but apostrophize his virtues, and a host of lesser folk copied this ill model. Over such an inscription not far from Hollingbourne at Boughton Monchelsea rests on his elbow a gentleman, clad in Roman garments, and it does not hesitate to congratulate his mother on having borne and reared him. All the same, the virtues applauded by such eulogies, domestic duty, public spirit, are virtues which it might do no harm to advertise upon our walls to-day. But the word "resurrection" has not vanished from monuments with the change of mood that came with the latter years of the seventeenth century. You may find it in places as various as Fulham, then a village in as sophisticated a countryside as has ever been, and remote Llanyblodwel in the Shropshire Marches of Wales.

[1] But also Elizabeth I's favourite, Leicester, could be buried at Warwick, after a not notably edifying life and beneath a far from diffident monument, *spe certi resurgendi in Christo*.

"In hope of a happy resurrection thro' Jesus Christ" Richard Hayes was buried in Cobham churchyard in 1790, and nobody who has paused to observe these documents of stone, that have so much to tell, will be surprised to read the word "resurrection" there. It survived into the nineteenth century on the funeral hatchments, which proclaimed the possession of armorial bearings, in the *Resurgam* that was traditionally painted on them, but then it was becoming as much an echo of the past as they.

During the nineteenth century there is, however, a new and genuinely Christian emphasis, marking the influence of the Evangelical Revival, which appears in not a few inscriptions. They trust that those whom they commemorate will be accepted—that is the great word—through the faith in their Saviour in which they died. Such inscriptions have not all the virility of Hollingbourne, but they are in refreshing contrast to the mixture of optimism and wistfulness that was now submerging the whole Christian hope. By default this retreat before sententious agnosticism (for that is what it was) has been aided by a lapse. Those who should have inherited and championed the robust apostolic faith, recovered and handed down by the seventeenth-century Church of England, of which they have often enough claimed to be the heirs, forsook it under the spell of the romanticism that has gothicked our worship, and returned to the language of the chantry or of its development by the Latin Continent. Language, indeed, was still to be met which a great seventeenth-century Principal of Jesus College, Oxford, of whom it is written in the chapel of that college, *Hic dormit sub spe resurrectionis*, would have recognized. The monument to Archbishop Harcourt in Stanton Harcourt church records that he *obdormuit in Christo* in 1847, and Archbishop Benson in writing to invite a friend to a daughter's funeral could call it, "Our dedication of her to the resurrection". But to speak that language had become rare, and now much slipshod talk about materialism has added to the mischief. In our own day mass production and the more even distribution of wealth have brought the possibility of a tablet within the reach of so many pockets that Diocesan Chancellors must perforce almost totally exclude such things, and the minds of worshippers, wandering from the service in years to come, will be unable to ponder upon what was believed in the middle of the twentieth century. Perhaps it is as well. It is only our lettering that Eric Gill has improved.[1]

But the story cannot just be left there. We used to be accused of preaching "pie in the sky". Now (mainly, one suspects, as a result of an undiscriminating deference to that accusation) the "sky" has largely disappeared from preaching, and what remains of it has often become so insubstantial, so falsely other-worldly, that it grips no one.

[1] To peruse the inscriptions in any present-day English cemetery is both desolating and revealing. The reiteration on stone after stone in one cemetery of the words, "Worth remembering", seemed to betray a catalogue origin. But undertakers are excellent people, who not only do a difficult work with discreet sympathy but are open to suggestions. Approaches to them and to other monumental masons might well result in the inclusion of strong Christian statements among the selections.

Is anybody likely to desire the anaemic heaven which is all the prize that is dangled before their eyes? Is anybody likely to be interested in a mere "beyond" that bears no real relation to the stuff of the here and now? In fact, nobody is. In real life it has become little more than a subject of mild ribaldry. Yet here is the point where the undiluted Gospel touches everybody, whatever their circumstances. All die, and from the time of the apostles onwards the ability to speak in firm terms of a grounded and lively hope has commanded a hearing. If we will believe it, something more is desired and expected of us (and of the obituary paragraph in the parish magazine) than timid sympathy. If we fail here, all else will prove, and is proving, futile, speak we never so relevantly of other things. But the other things ought not to be other things, belonging only to this age, for those who have been told that "the whole creation cranes its neck, waiting for the revealing of the sons of God".

Meanwhile ways and habits change. The cremation that becomes steadily and speedily more usual might have shocked Lord Culpeper and Dame Grace Gethin and those who wrote their inscriptions, but only an unduly literalistic interpretation of the truths those inscriptions convey can object to it on theological grounds. Aesthetically there is a kind of smoothness about its procedure that can be unpleasing. The crematorium cannot have a certain elemental grandeur that the pyre must have had. But the questions to be asked about the customs that come to surround cremation, and may soon become established, are altogether more than aesthetic questions. Do these customs consort with and convey Christian truth? On the contrary, nothing could be devised more compendiously by every inference to contradict it than the scattering (and sometimes far worse) of the ashes. Yet their solemn committal, "earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust", altogether more meaningful than a committal of the body to the fire, might be the very means of restoring an understanding of something too deep for words alone to convey.

Only the language of poetry, of symbolism, and not least the symbolism of normal procedure, can convey it, but, most of all, it is the language of the New Testament that needs to be restored. One will not be afraid to see and to preach the New Jerusalem in terms of the contemporary scene that has drawn so many new wonders for us out of God's creation. That is a most necessary undertaking. But that which was written with such direct simplicity out of the Bible of Lord Culpeper and Dame Grace stands, and awaits our recovery of it for our undescrying generation. He "ordered his body here to expect a joyful resurrection". She "victoriously entered into rest".

FRANK BENNETT.

Commentaries on the Acts of the Apostles

Part I (for General Readers)

Of the half-dozen small commentaries on Acts the shortest is the most important. R. R. Williams (Torch Bible Commentaries, S.C.M. Press, London, 1953) puts the emphasis on the gospel in Acts rather than on the question of whether this or that historical detail is reliable, though these questions are adequately covered. Acts becomes much more interesting and alive. It is treated as a whole under the theme "Nothing can stop the gospel", and it is regarded, in the way the author meant it to be regarded, as symmetrical with his Gospel. The journey to Jerusalem, the Passion and the Resurrection of Jesus are echoed in the journey, "passion" and safe arrival of Paul at Rome (a suggestion made first by Rackham).

J. Vernon Bartlet's commentary (The Century Bible, T. C. and E. C. Jack, London and Edinburgh, 1902) is often seen in second-hand shops and must lie neglected on many bookshelves. It is a most lively and acute work, conservative in its conclusions (as all British commentaries since J. B. Lightfoot and Sir William Ramsay have been), but with enough disturbing suggestions on the way to make us think again.

J. Alexander Findlay (S.C.M. Press, London, 1934) gives a good account of the theology with a dash of the historical romancing which most commentators, beginning with the compiler of the "Western" Text in the second century, have been unable to resist. All good story-tellers get their stories retold with embroidering. A. W. F. Blunt's commentary (The Clarendon Bible, Oxford, 1922) is very full and thorough and is illustrated with some magnificent reproductions (see, for example, the delightful fourteenth-century portrait of Paul in glasses, p. 259), but I found the style a little heavy. There is an abridgement of this work for schools.

For an impressive exposition of Acts as a missionary book in a missionary situation Laurence E. Browne's commentary (The Indian Church Commentaries, S.P.C.K., London and Madras, 1925) is worth consulting. Perhaps teachers would find in the short play "How the story was written" at the beginning of the book an example of what their classes could do for themselves (but don't let Paul make conversation in the words of his more weighty theological utterances from the A.V.).

William Barclay's commentary (The Daily Study Bible, Saint Andrew Press, Edinburgh, 2nd ed., 1955) is meant to be used for daily meditation. It is sprinkled with sermon illustrations and concludes each section with a religious application which is more or less related to the text. If parsons can't resist using this for their sermons, they should at least consult something more meaty as well.

Three recent books which are not, strictly speaking, commentaries are very illuminating. C. F. D. Moule in *Christ's Messengers*, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, Part I (the first of three parts, World Christian Books, No. 19, sponsored by the International Missionary

Council and others, Lutterworth Press, London, 1957), covers the first few chapters under three headings—the Witness of Action, the Witness of Words and the Witness of Community Life. It is beautifully written, it does not shirk the difficulties (there is a good discussion of miracles), and by an unobtrusive appeal to a wide variety of ancient and modern writers it illuminates and illustrates many important features of the story.

The other two are new translations of Acts, one by J. B. Phillips, *The Young Church in Action* (Geoffrey Bles, London, 1955), and the other by C. H. Rieu (The Penguin Classics, 1957), whose father did the Four Gospels in the same series. Rieu includes an Introduction and Notes, best on the setting in the ancient world and the text, and on the whole I prefer his translation to Phillips's. He is at once more idiomatic and less colloquial. Acts suffers more than most books from being read in brief sections; take one of these translations and read it aloud to your family in long episodes, for that was how it was originally "published", and see how the sweep of the story comes across.

The larger commentaries on the English text are a disappointing lot. The latest is C. S. C. Williams's (Black's New Testament Commentaries, London, 1957), which, although it provides the clearest and most complete statement of the present position, marks little progress in the study of Acts. G. H. C. Magregor (in The Interpreter's Bible, Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, New York and Nashville, Vol. IX, 1954) has written a comparable work, but the larger space allowed for the commentary enables him to discuss the critical difficulties more fully and candidly.

R. B. Rackham's book (Westminster Commentaries, Methuen, London, 1901) is very much out of date on most of the critical questions, but the writing is so good that we can bear to read through the defence of Blass's textual theory (for example) for the sake of the acute theological comments. The commentary reflects Rackham's High Church position, but this does direct out attention to the fact that "Luke" was a catholic, as well as a glorifier of the simplicities of the first Christian communities' life.

Besides the commentary on the Greek mentioned below, F. F. Bruce has also written one on the English text (The New London Commentary on the New Testament, Marshall, Morgan and Scott, London and Edinburgh, 1954) in which his aim is to go on from the critical foundation to expound Acts as God's Word for us. The result is a scholarly paraphrase of the text, in some ways even more fully documented than the earlier work, illustrated with stories from contemporary evangelical hagiography.

F. J. Foakes-Jackson (The Moffat New Testament Commentary, London, 1931) seems to have known so much about Acts that he has been unable to descend from generality and vagueness to the brevity and concreteness necessary in a relatively short commentary.

There are four interesting books about Acts in general which are worth mentioning. W. L. Knox, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Cambridge, 1948) sums up a long English tradition going back to the

beginnings of modern biblical study in the seventeenth century. With immense scholarship, lightly worn, and patient historical ingenuity, he defends the traditional authorship and the general eye-witness character of the book. The great predecessor in this line, a popular work in the best sense, is Sir William Ramsay's *St Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen* (Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1895, reprinted many times), in which the author employs a close knowledge of the geography of the region, and endless ingenuity, to show that Luke was a first-rate historian. He argues that the details of the story are true, and that attempts to produce discrepancies between Acts and Paul's Epistles have arisen from inadequate attention to the unmarked chronological gaps left by the consummate historian who omitted what was unimportant.

This is a great tradition, but one charged with emotion, as is clear when we turn to H. J. Cadbury's *The Making of Luke–Acts* (Macmillan, New York and London, 1927). Cadbury, who is an American Quaker, has been deeply influenced by this tradition, but he imports into it a patient refusal to go beyond the evidence. He limits himself to examining with care and precision the author's materials, methods, personality and purpose as they can be discovered from the two books alone, relegating to a final chapter the larger, less certain, and (he argues) less important questions of authorship and date.

The fourth book is the English translation of Martin Dibelius's essays, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (S.C.M. Press, London, 1956). Dibelius accepts the traditional authorship, but lifts the discussion to a new level by insisting again and again that the chief business of exegesis is to discover Luke's theological purpose. His writing has the excesses of greatness, but is rightly affecting the discussion both on the Continent and in this country.

Part II (for Students)

There is space to mention only the English commentaries on the Greek text published since 1900, and two significant foreign commentaries, one French and the other German.

F. F. Bruce's notes on the Greek text contain a great deal of useful grammatical and geographical information. The commentary as a whole (The Tyndale Press, London, 1951) is dominated by the fairly limited purpose of showing that Acts was an apology for the early Church written before Paul's death by his companion Luke. R. J. Knowling's commentary (in The Expositor's Greek Testament, Vol. II, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1900) contains an even greater amount of the sort of information given by Bruce; it is mainly valuable for its repeated reference to the British and German discussions raging at the time it was written.

The basic work is, of course, the five-volume series *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Part I, The Acts of the Apostles, edited by F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (Macmillan, London 1920 to 1933). Volume I deals with the Jewish and Gentile Worlds and Primitive Christianity; Volume II, the composition and purpose of Acts, the identity of the editor, and the history of criticism (the essays of

W. K. L. Clarke on the LXX and A. C. McGiffert on Historical Criticism of Acts in Germany are noteworthy); Volume III, the magnificent text of J. H. Ropes with Codex Vaticanus on one page and Codex Bezae on the other; and Volumes IV and V, translation, commentary and notes. This corpus is basic, but no more. Even a cursory reading of the commentary and notes shows that the authors have deliberately confined themselves to a limited range of questions—questions about meaning, historical accuracy, the contemporary circumstances which would throw light on the meaning—without attempting to gather up the results into a comprehensive exegesis.

It is a complete contrast to turn to the work of one man, Alfred Loisy, whose commentary (Émile Nourry, Paris, 1920) was published in the same year as the first volume of *The Beginnings*. The general theory which he espouses, that Acts consists of a drastic editing and expansion of a book by Luke, is unlikely, but at least it takes into account the standpoint of an author who had no part in what happened, while employing sources written by those who did. The most valuable contribution is his 800 pages of commentary, full of perspicacious observation and shrewd discussion. One is struck, in this part at least, by the finely balanced judgment of such a notable rebel.

The most satisfactory commentary of all is by Ernst Haenchen (Meyer Commentary, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1956). The introduction is a model of lucidity. Haenchen is rightly conservative about all textual questions: he shows that the Alexandrian text is overwhelmingly superior, and that it stands extremely close to the text the author wrote, there being no need (or excuse) for assuming an immediate Aramaic original. On authorship and date he argues that Acts was not the work of Paul's companion, but that it was written in the 80's under Domitian (the date accepted by most scholars). He has come near to producing at least one unassailable contradiction between Paul's epistles and Acts, rather harder to knock down than the usual straw men, showing that the author could not have been Paul's companion.

In the commentary itself he adopts the procedure, more common in English commentaries than in German, of following the verse-by-verse exposition with a general discussion of each section. Under Dibelius's influence he makes fresh efforts to penetrate to the theology of the author, and again and again throws new light on the passage. This is not to say that he neglects to look for sources or to try to understand what actually happened: he is remarkably successful at that too. The picture that emerges is of a book written when the apostolic time was over, and of a Church looking back to the golden age when the gospel spread from Jerusalem to the gentile world. The catholic period has begun.

J. C. O'Neill.

New Approaches to the Doctrine of the Church

THE doctrine of the Church necessarily holds a central place in all ecumenical discussion, and for a number of years there has been a sustained effort to follow out the line of thought which in England was opened up, for instance, by the Archbishop of York in *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*. There has been an attempt to see the relationship between the structure of the Church and the very structure of the Gospel message, to work out as fully as possible the connexion between the nature and ministry of Christ and the nature and ministry of his Body. The Faith and Order Conference at Lund in 1952 further underlined the importance of developing this inquiry, which has already proved fruitful in bringing together apparently conflicting ideas of the nature of the Church into a deeper and fuller understanding of its character and mission.

The present article draws largely on the work of a group of younger Orthodox theologians, both Greek and Russian, whose thought, little known as yet in England, seems peculiarly relevant to a number of ecumenical issues. In particular it is based on an essay on *The Ecclesiology of St Ignatius of Antioch*, written by an American scholar of Greek origin, John S. Romanides.[1] This work, though personal to its author, is representative of a recent tendency in Orthodox thinking about the Church; we intend to examine and compare it with the writings of two Western theologians of established repute. The results may perhaps be disturbing to certain accustomed Anglican attitudes of mind. I believe none the less that they will prove exhilarating, and will bring out unexpected similarities of thought in writers of very different ecclesiastical backgrounds.

The words with which Fr Romanides begins his study are indicative of his whole approach to the subject. "The key to understanding the ecclesiology of St Ignatius is clearly his presuppositions concerning salvation. As will be indicated, the Church as the body of Christ exists, according to St Ignatius, for the sole purpose of salvation in Christ."[2] St Ignatius's thought about salvation is therefore sketched in bold and vivid phrases, liberation from the power of death and evil by the defeat of Satan in the crucifixion and resurrection of the Lord, restoration to the life of God through incorporation into Christ and participation in his Body, "only the flesh and blood of the resurrected God-man are the source of life and resurrection for all men of all ages (Ign. Eph. 1, 7, 19, 20; Mag. 6, 8; Smyr. 1, 3; Pol. 3; Mag. 9; Phil. 5. 9)".[3] It is in this context of an intensely corporate, and intensely Pauline view of the nature of salvation, that St Ignatius's doctrine of the Church must be set. It is by incorporation into Christ,

[1] John S. Romanides, D.D.(Athens), *The Ecclesiology of St Ignatius of Antioch*. I am grateful to Fr Romanides for permission to quote from this paper recently published in America. Cf. also the Rev. Alexander Schmemann, "Unity, Division, Reunion, in the light of Orthodox Ecclesiology" (in English), *Theologia* (Athens), 1951, Vol. XXII, pp. 242–54, and Jean Meyendorff, "Sacrements et Hiérarchie dans l'Eglise", *Dieu Vivant*, No. 26, 1954, pp. 81–91.

[2] Op. cit. [3] Ibid.

by participation in the life of faith and love of the local congregation that we are freed from the powers of this world. To break the unity of the local congregation is therefore to destroy the very basis of life in Christ. And it is this which, as Sir Edwyn Hoskyns so magnificently demonstrated, lies at the foundation of St Ignatius's concern for Church Order.[1] No one is more insistent than he on the place of the bishop in the Church, no one demonstrates more clearly the impossibility of divorcing episcopate from congregation. Fr Romanides writes: "As all other things pertaining to the Church, the clergy also exists for the purpose of preserving and increasing the life of unity and love *epi to auto*, in the flesh and blood of Christ. . . . The authority of the clergy is founded exclusively upon the mysteries of unity in Christ and not at all upon any imagined personal power of magic. The clergy as such cannot save. Only the resurrected flesh of Christ saves when received in unity and selfless love for each other *epi to auto*. Even within the corporate life of the mysteries it is Christ and not the Church that saves. The Church locally manifested is herself *being saved* by the Father who continuously sends his Spirit to form the body of Christ gathered *epi to auto* (epiclesis, John 16. 7–11; 1 John 3. 23)."[2] Or again, "because all the faithful communicated at every Eucharist, and since it was necessary to maintain the various orders of catechumens and penitents, it is quite obvious that the presbytery and diaconate were absolutely necessary as concelebrants of the bishop and as a council to help in regulating the penitents, in preparing the catechumens, and in general in ruling the community and teaching. What distinguishes the clergy from the rest of the community is not any individual power to administer the mysteries as intermediaries between God and man. The whole community is the body of Christ in which God himself operates salvation in the corporate mysteries. . . . The clergy are not over the local body, but themselves members of the local body who are given the special charisma of being the centre of unity and the regulating force which protects and increases (Eph. 4. 11–13) the life of corporate love in Christ."[3]

We have here a doctrine of the Church founded on the Eucharist; everything in it is ordered towards the building up of the life of the local congregation, in whose unity of faith and love the powers of evil and death are being destroyed by the power of the risen Son of God. All the marks of the Church find their true expression here. The infallibility of the Church, Fr Romanides writes,

> "is to know the devil and how he is destroyed by God in Christ by the Holy Spirit *epi to auto*. All dogma is implied in eucharistic experience, which in turn is the test of heresy. ' . . . our opinion is in accordance with the Eucharist, and the Eucharist in turn establishes our opinion' (Irenaeus Adv. Haer., Bk. IV, xviii, 5). . . . Dogmatic truth is an ever present and existential reality fully manifested by the Holy Spirit at every eucharistic gathering. The infallibility of the Church, expressed in Ecu-

[1] E. C. Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, pp. 100–6.

[2] Romanides, op. cit. For the New Testament use of the phrase *epi to auto* in connexion with the Christian assembly, cf. Acts 2. 44, 47 and 1 Cor. 11. 20 and 14. 23.

[3] Ibid.

menical Councils and elsewhere, is rooted in the very life of love *epi to auto*. Infallibility is a moral experience and so cannot be separated from the life of selfless love in the mysteries. Only God is infallible, and this infallibility the body of Christ shares directly and existentially in the corporate mysteries of unity wherein the very powers of falsehood and division are destroyed by God himself who by his Spirit forms his Son in those who believe in love. 'For when you assemble frequently in the same place (*epi to auto*) the powers of Satan are destroyed and the destruction at which he aims is prevented by the unity of your faith' (Ign. Eph. 13)."[1]

From this it follows that the fullness of the Catholic Church exists in each local church gathered in one place around its bishop and presbyters. Between these local churches there is unity of identity in Christ, not of federation or subordination. This is a point on which not only Fr Romanides, but a number of Orthodox theologians have recently insisted.[2] In the work at present under review, the author writes:

"An abstract federation of communities whereby each body is a member of a more general body reduces the Eucharist to a secondary position and makes possible the heretical idea that there is a membership in the body of Christ higher and more profound than the corporate life of local love for real people, and thus the whole meaning of the incarnation of God and the destruction of Satan in a certain place and at a certain time in history is destroyed. . . . Each community having the fullness of Eucharistic life is related to other communities not by a common participation in something greater than the local life in the Eucharist, but by an identity of existence in Christ, ' . . . Wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church' (Ign Smyr. 8)."[3]

To these words let us juxtapose, as closely as possible, some words of Bishop Lesslie Newbigin:

"I believe that the divinely willed form of the Church's unity is at least this, a visible company in every place of all who confess Jesus as Lord, abiding together in the Apostles' teaching and fellowship, the breaking of bread and prayers. Its foci are the word, the sacraments and the apostolic ministry. Its form is the visible fellowship, not of those whom we choose out to be our friends, but of those whom God has actually given us as our neighbours. It is therefore simply humanity in every place re-created in Christ. It is the place where *all* men can be made one because all are made nothing, where one new humanity in Christ is being daily renewed because the old man in *every* man is being brought to crucifixion through word, baptism and supper. Its unity is universal because it is local and congregational. Believing this, I am bound to believe that all conceptions of reunion in terms of federation are vain. They leave the heart of the problem —which is the daily life of men and women in their neighbourhood—untouched. They demand no death and resurrection as the price of unity. . . . They envisage a sort of unity whose foci are not the word and sacraments of the Gospel in the setting of the local congregation, but the conference table and the committee room."[4]

It is hardly necessary to insist on the striking similarities between

[1] Ibid.

[2] Cf. "The Local Church is that sacramental organism which in its bishop possesses the fullness of Christ, the fullness of unity, of holiness, of catholicity and apostolicity." "The point is not that all these local churches *together* constitute a single organism, but that each church, as a church, as a sacramental unity, is the same Church, manifested in a given place." A. Schmemann, *Theologia*, Vol. XXII, pp. 246 and 247.

[3] Ibid.

[4] L. Newbigin, *The Household of God*, pp. 21–22.

the two positions; and this despite the fact that the writers are considering very different problems—the one that of bringing together into unity bodies of separated Christians, the other that of the unity which already exists between the Orthodox Churches. For both, the heart of the problem lies in the building up of the local congregation into the Body of Christ, the transformation of "the daily life of men and women in their neighbourhood", the local "unity of faith and love of real people living together their life in Christ". In both cases there is the same assertion that "the unity is universal because it is local and congregational", or, as Romanides puts it, it is evident not in a federation of local committees but in "their identity of existence in Christ". For both writers the essential focus of unity must be found within the life of the local congregation, and not around the conference table or in the committee room. Presumably neither would wish to deny the legitimacy of conferences, synods, etc., but both would stress that it is not in them, but in the sacraments of the Gospel in which men die and rise with Christ that the essential features of the Church, the body of Christ, are to be found.

From Bishop Lesslie Newbigin we turn to Prof. T. F. Torrance and his recently published book *Royal Priesthood*. It is clear from the first that there will be profound differences between his exposition of the Church's nature and that of Fr Romanides. To mention one thing only, the eschatological character of his thought has a quality different from that of the Orthodox writer; for though, as we shall see, Fr Romanides does not at all ignore the situation of the Church "between the times", Orthodox tradition regards the Church, especially when gathered in worship, as already participating in the fullness of the Kingdom. It would be entirely beyond the scope of this article to give a full appreciation of Prof. Torrance's remarkable study. All that is intended is to take a number of points from it, without it is hoped doing violence to the context, and indicate resemblances with the thought of Fr Romanides. Perhaps we shall not be so surprised at their similarity when we reflect that both writers share a common desire to be true "to the teaching of the New Testament and of the old Catholic Fathers"[1] and a common concern to emphasize the danger of "making the episcopate the sole sign and guarantee of the unity and continuity of the Church", and seek instead "a fuller integration of the episcopate with the presbyterate in the ministry of Word and Sacrament and an integration of the whole Church in the eucharistic fellowship".[2]

In the first place both insist that the creation of the Church is the direct work of the Creator Spirit. "We have to think of the whole relation between the Spirit and the Body in terms of the Word of Christ uttered creatively in the Church through the Spirit, and not simply in terms of the divine cause and a creaturely operation,"[3] writes Prof. Torrance; and this at once suggests a comparison with Fr. Romanides' assertion that "the very basis of all Orthodox doctrine . . . is the fact that God creates, sustains and saves creation

[1] T. F. Torrance, *Royal Priesthood*, p. 94.
[2] Ibid., p. 108. [3] Ibid., p. 24.

not by created means but by his own life-giving energies".[1] Consequently there can be no possibility for either of regarding the Church in institutional or mechanical terms. The Church is brought into being "through Christ the Word made flesh, and through his uttered Word calling men into obedience and love", and this Prof. Torrance stresses is an "acutely personal action".[2] Fr Romanides writes: "Grace cannot be manipulated and distributed by man; he can only partake of this uncreated light of God in the corporate life of selfless love in the flesh of Christ locally manifested and formed by God himself in real people *epi to auto*."[3] For both writers it goes without saying that the Church lives not of itself, but in the life of the Son of God. "By Baptism we are incorporated into One Body but that unity is preserved (1 Cor. 10. 16 ff.; 12. 12 f.) and made visible in the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. 11. 18 ff.). Here the whole life and form of the Church's life are seen to derive from a source beyond the Church, in the Blood and Body of Christ, and can only be maintained by continual return to that source."[4] Both stress to the utmost, in the face of any tendency to demythologize, the scandalous reality of the risen and ascended flesh of Christ in which we participate through the Sacraments. But for both "participation in the Sacraments is not in itself a guarantee of salvation, for along with sacramental communion there must go the whole building up and ordering of the Body in the love of Christ. When the Sacraments are taken in conjunction with the bodily obedience they involve, they reveal the true form and order of the Church."[5] Fr Romanides similarly insists that "baptism is not a magical guarantee", and that it is only by an effort of obedience and love that through the power of Christ the Christian is built up into the life of the Body. "On this side of death the Body of Christ is the Church of the Passover continuously crossing the Red Sea and constantly escaping the forces of Pharaoh by participation in the death and resurrection of the Lord *epi to auto*. At each Eucharist the chosen people, the New Zion, gathers together triumphantly on the banks of the Red Sea, opposite the hosts of Pharaoh, glorifies God for the salvation already granted and simultaneously awaits the final victory. On the difficult and dangerous road to the Land of Promise, from Sunday to Sunday, and from day to day, one may fall into the hands of Satan and be cut off from the body of Christ. The Church this side of death is in process of formation—the Word made flesh is being formed in the faithful by the Holy Spirit (1 John 3. 23–4), and thus the Church although already the Body of Christ is continuously becoming what she is."[6]

It will by now be clear that for both Prof. Torrance and Fr Romanides the whole structure of the Church exists in order that the faithful may be built up into the life of sacrificial and selfless love, which is the life of Christ. "Everything turns upon the building up of the Church in love as the Body of Christ. The Church which has communicated in the Body and Blood of Christ is committed in its

[1] Romanides, op. cit.
[2] Torrance, op. cit., p. 24.
[3] Romanides, op. cit.
[4] Torrance, op. cit., p. 64.
[5] Ibid., p. 64.
[6] Romanides, op. cit.

whole life in the body to bodily obedience in love, but that is to be expressed in the ordering of the Church within its own membership."[1] The priesthood of the Church is corporate, and the special priesthood of the ordained ministry exists in and for the whole body, though it is not the creation of the body. Prof. Torrance speaks of the episcopate "placed within the Body" and partaking "of its inner cohesion in mutual service and love".[2] Fr Romanides comments: "According to Ignatius the faithful are not saved through the bishop as an individual. . . . The Church as the very Body of Christ has God himself operating salvation in Christ by his Spirit in the corporate mysteries."[3]

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that we have here the beginnings of a remarkably rich and satisfying doctrine of the Church. In the first place, full justice is done to the congregationalist insistence on the reality and completeness of the gathered local church. Secondly, by showing the immediate and indissoluble connexion between salvation in Christ and the form of the Church, a pressing evangelical demand is answered. And, at the same time, the fact that the Church's structure and life are rooted in the Sacraments of the Gospel is expressed with unusual clarity. Lines of approach which in the past have appeared to be mutually exclusive are now seen to be complementary. Both those who abandoned and those who retained episcopacy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries seem to have started from common inadequate presuppositions, for both were obsessed with the idea of bishops as primarily governors *over* the Church. The extent to which the pastoral and liturgical functions of the bishop had been obscured in practice, made it difficult to see him as the centre of unity *in* the local church. It is not then surprising that at a time when we are being led both in thought and action towards a rediscovery of unity, we should find ourselves forced into a radical rethinking of our theory of the nature and function of episcopacy. The process this involves may in time demand the consideration of a number of purely practical questions, but before all else we need to investigate more deeply the relation of the ministry to the Church. And for this one of our first requirements will be, as Père Louis Bouyer has suggested, an elucidation of the unity of episcopate with presbyterate, rather than of the distinction between them, and of the unity of both in the life and *diakonia* of the Church the Body of Christ.

A. M. Allchin.

Pamphlets at Pusey House

"Anarchy: an appeal to members of the English Church." This is the darkly suggestive title of one of the twenty thousand pamphlets from the Pamphlet Library in Pusey House, Oxford.[4] It might serve

[1] Torrance, op. cit., p. 66. [2] Ibid., p. 92. [3] Romanides, op. cit.

[4] Pusey House, Oxford, has a large collection of nineteenth-century pamphlets which are now being catalogued and made available for the student.

for a description of the contents of the Pamphlet Library itself, now in process of being catalogued. Here is the nineteenth century at cross-purposes and crossing swords; speaking, preaching, charging, pleading, reporting, vociferating, abusing, sorrowing, demurring, explaining, laughing through the five reigns from 1810 to 1910.

Good sea-coal fires, the domestic staff, and a contentious warmth of conviction, kept controversial pens busy in and out of vicarages. *Everything* was printed, folded and posted. Printed to last, too. Our own cyclostyled ephemera will have withered long before the Penny Reds shall have so much as peeled off the back covers of Pusey's. Those pamphlets that kept going the houses of Parker and Rivingtons still have an air—title page, bastard title, dedication, commendation, advertisement, all complete; and across the top in an angular scrawl, "With the Author's Compliments".

Here are the opinions, hopes, fears and misunderstandings, not of the great ones—though Pusey, Keble, Manning, Phillpotts of Exeter, Gladstone, Lord John Russell and the others do appear—but of the satellites, Grueber, Littledale, Mayow, Beresford Hope and perhaps five thousand others. The bishops are there, holding synod, issuing charge upon charge, while behind their chairs lurk the pseudonyms, Truthful Diggins pointing to "Quagmire ahead", Philip Plainspoken with an eye cocked at Gladstone; unknown or perhaps all too well known. In the wings stand the anonymous aggrieved, "a clergyman of the diocese" of London, of Oxford, of Canterbury, of Winchester, of York, "a priest", "a presbyter"—but who is to tell the difference? —"a layman" of every colour and creed.

This is the raw material for the historian. But it is also the sowing of the present, or, it may be now, the more recent past. For here are not the Emperors nor the marshals of the Imperial army resettling provinces under the Code of the First Six Centuries and the Caroline Divines; but rather the exploding, expostulating cajoling proconsuls, procurators and minor officials whose often wrongheaded faithfulness, prejudice and passionate misinterpretations were communicated to the parishioner and became the background of our grandfathers' churchgoing.

What engaged them? Take a round thousand of pamphlets from the years 1830 to 1870 and we can relive something of their excitements and despairs.

It is a swaying battle. In the noisy heart of it more than a hundred pamphlets are fairly evenly matched along the frontier where Church schooling tries to hold the Socinian Adventurers of the Manchester and Salford Scheme. On the right flank another fifty are embroiled in the turning movement of the Church Rate Question and Tithe Commutation. On the left, fifteen more advance across difficult terrain, but unopposed, for the "Rights of the Workingman". Suddenly it seems that a double attack threatens from the rear and thirty pamphlets dash to repulse the Papacy, and twenty more, Dissent. Only eleven in all the field can be found to go unarmed between the ranks as stretcher-bearers in the cause of Unity. Seventy more in two parties set out for the wood marked State Con-

trol, but with different orders; one to seize and occupy, one merely to contain. As a result they fall one upon the other in mistake. Two other parties of twenty each are despatched to thickets named "Essays and Reviews" and "Colenso", there to round up and summarily execute presumed deserters.

Elsewhere the scene is more peaceful—debate rather than arms. A sort of rookery, clerical and lay, and more than a hundred strong, discusses the use of synods and the revival of convocation; fifty more, the revision of the Prayer Book, of liturgy, of ritual; twenty-five, marriage and divorce.

Here and there courts set themselves up. One group of forty-five either hangs or gains reprieve for the Archdeacon of Taunton in the Eucharistic controversy. Fifty others would banish Gorham in the Baptismal one. Fifteen want to make a cause of the Burial Office but can find no life in it. Meanwhile, a handful bicker about Oxford University's internal affairs and the appointment of Prof. Jowett; and twice as many about episcopacy or the Irish Church. Thirty remember the colonies and missions oversea, the work of U.M.C.A., S.P.G., S.P.C.K., and the foundings of Canterbury, of the University of Sydney, of the diocese of Fredericton, in New Zealand, New South Wales, New Brunswick. Ten record the founding of penitentiaries and religious houses at Wantage, Plymouth and elsewhere. Eight remember the Mutiny and beat their breasts, but only three discover war in the Crimea.

It was anarchy, and yet this turbid flood of ceaseless printing was fed by minds and received by minds who plainly cared deeply; and as plainly achieved, not always what they sought to, but something. Here then lies the historian's dish, piled high, waiting to be tasted, swallowed perhaps, and digested. And the whole is seasoned too, for the scholar, with satire, gaiety, wit and downright oddness. He need not drudge, unrelieved, through the 1,600 pages of the Hoare correspondence. He can look over the bent shoulder of "Elizabeth" at her "commentary on the viith chapter of Daniel", or smirk with "the Contented Widow". In the early history of missions he can share with the first bishop of Labuan his brush with pirates off the coast of Borneo. At home he can be present at "the successful amputation of the thigh during the mesmeric state without the knowledge of the patient". Fevered in controversy, he can apply "Aquaemerrasquae, or a cataplasm of Columbo-root" or consider the "Short Essay on Natural Selters Waters". Between the lines of the Eucharistic controversy he may share in the partisan affection of Grueber at Hambridge for Denison at East Brent, or agree with Denison's dismissal of a brother archdeacon in the single sweep across the tail of his pamphlet: Crass!

Here is the layered cliff of the past, waiting to be read: the unforeseen, the passing, the projected; the accomplished, the deplored, the might-have-been. Here are the men. Here, in the first thirty years of Victoria, is the voice of only one woman, Miss Angela Burdett-Coutts. Here are the drifts, trends, and what other abstractions, to be drawn out. Here above all are perspectives of the nineteenth-

century English mind as it gazes self-oblivious in concentration, as if salvation were at stake. Here, at any rate, is a scholar's challenge and a collector's delight.

Till now the sheer bulk of the Pamphlet Library has been a deterrent, as in the exploring of any dark continent. But the cataloguing begins at last to reveal natural divisions, river complexes, trade routes. The library is discovered to be a congeries of lesser libraries, collected by men such as Dean Church, Archdeacon Denison, Lord Halifax, and A. J. Stephens, Q.C. Each is a whole in itself with something of a natural life-span and a ruling interest. Within the libraries, the cataloguing has largely left the pamphlets to speak for themselves. They stand in their bound volumes as they once stood on their collector's shelves and in his mind. But now each pamphlet is marked with its serial number, and each volume has been indexed, and on its spine there stands the number of its first and last pamphlet and the year or span of years which the volume covers. The student can simply browse along the shelves among the years that concern him. If he wishes to be more purposeful, there is a card-index of titles by which he can locate a known pamphlet, its sequels, replies and later editions. There is also an index of authors. Here he can select an author's card and read off the serial numbers both of the pamphlets by him and of all those referring to or addressing him. Finally, he has in the Hand List a catalogue of all the titles, set out under their serial number, from which he can select his own interest, follow up cross-references, and refer directly to the shelves.

The first phase of the cataloguing, the arrangement of the individual libraries and the numbering of the books, is already complete. The indexing of the pamphlets, also, is far enough advanced to be used by students up to the year 1900. It is hoped that the catalogue as a whole will be finished in some months. Inquiries should be addressed to the Custodian of the Library, Pusey House, Oxford.

HUGH, S.S.F.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. Frank Bennett is Vicar of Maidstone and an Hon. Canon of Canterbury Cathedral.

Mr O'Neill is engaged in theological research at Clare College, Cambridge.

The Rev. A. M. Allchin is Curate of St Mary Abbotts, Kensington.

Father Hugh is a member of the Society of St Francis.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE LIFE AND DEATH OF SYMBOLS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

In your January issue, the Reverend Antony Bridge made a valuable and stimulating contribution to the vexed question of the role to be played by myth and symbol to-day. There was one point, however, that he did not mention which has an important bearing upon his thesis: he did not make it clear that this generation is far more conscious of the distinctive character of symbolism than previous generations have been; the nature and validity of symbolism is now debated where before symbols themselves were being adopted and discarded. It is true that Luther distinguished between imagery and the ideas expressed by imagery, in order to justify some of his own more fanciful excursions into Hell's scenery, but the detailed study of symbolism is a new science, stemming from a growing interest in anthropology and the alleged contradictions between scientific historical data and religious myths. "Myth" as a commonly used technical term is a recent innovation.

So a new situation arises, in which myth and symbol are used, self-consciously, with an eye on the exact meaning and content of the ideas to be expressed. This reduces myth and symbol to the role of media pure and simple and does not allow them full value in themselves. In fact, this comes out in Mr Bridge's article itself, where no clear distinction is made between symbol and myth, whereas it can be maintained that while a symbol stands for, represents, a thing or an idea, a myth has a character and importance of its own, in harmony with the idea it expresses. Thus, a symbol invites and expects translation, a myth is of value and teaches while as yet untranslated —in fact, it almost always loses by translation. The myth, then, should not be translated as long as it retains its value, as long as it has power to make living sense to a generation. The symbol, on the other hand, is probably of shorter duration and gains by frequent renewal.

But now we find both myth and symbol being deliberately rethought, new mythologies being consciously worked out. And this is dangerous: the myth is both an end in itself as well as the vehicle of (often otherwise inexpressible) truths; mythical truth is so deep and rich that it is inevitably impoverished and lessened by analysis and re-translation. Consequently, I would go further than Mr Bridge in opposing any deliberate policy of remythologization. I do not believe that it is possible to distil truth unharmed from myth, to dissolve it in some brew of our own concoction and at the end to produce the mixture as before. Myth, to be a genuine vehicle of truth, must take its own form in spontaneous growth out of the environment in which the truth is experienced. At present, this growth is hindered by a tendency to cling to the old myths for their own sake and because our leaders have had the knowledge or the leisure to get to know and

to value them. But, to borrow Mr Bridge's analogy, it seems timid, to say the least, to suggest that we should try to win for the New Testament myths only the same fractional increase in popularity as that accorded to Piero della Francesca by a select few.

Give the Holy Spirit a chance! The unfettered expression of Christian faith and experience in as many twentieth-century terms and idioms as possible should provide the opportunity for the growth of a new mythology capable of carrying the Gospel to modern industrialized society. One line along which it might well be profitable to work is that of economics. "Materialism" has for too long been a bad word among theologians. When taken to mean a system that excludes all specifically "spiritual" or "eternal" values, it is of course in opposition to Christianity, but in the simple sense of a preoccupation with pounds, shillings and pence, with the solid and tangible, I am not convinced that it excludes a spiritual interpretation of matter. Nor is it certain that we are right to welcome the "widespread reaction against materialist humanism", noted by Mr Bridge. Dissatisfaction with it as a system may also be fear of its conclusions and consequences, some of which have a very definite Christian application. Christians should be more concerned to draw Christian conclusions from materialist humanism, to develop its theology, than to join in with the fashion of the day in decrying it. We may dislike the present uses to which it is put, the conclusions which are currently drawn, but this should not prevent us being prepared to accept and work with much that is true in it.

The ordinary man to-day is still (*pace* Mr Bridge) a materialist humanist at heart and the terminology of materialist humanism makes sense to him. Is it too much to expect that it should make Christian sense to him? Surely Christian love can be well expressed in an answer to his question, "What do you get out of it all?" I personally find more joy and wonder in regarding the Incarnation and the Atonement in the severely material terms of gift than in Old Testament sacrificial language, which speaks now only to the heavy consciences of a few members of respectable society, and also of course to the theologians who have had the leisure to study and appreciate its meaning. The Eucharist, and in particular the Offertory, is a fully material action at the very heart of the Christian Faith. Its spiritual truth can be expressed in material terms; if we were prepared to draw the material conclusions implied I do not think that we should hear so much about the lack of relevance and revolution in Christianity to-day.

I am not here advocating any particular economic theory or ethic. All I have tried to do is to take Mr Bridge's argument one stage further. Whether mine be a blind-alley or no, I want to thank him for making at least one person think.

Yours sincerely,
ROBERT HUGHES.

COVENTRY.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Mr Bridge states that "the leading ideas (of any particular age) are the 'truths' which artists have been concerned to communicate". This as a partial truth is, I think, misleading. Was it simply such "leading ideas" that Beethoven strove to express in music? He was, one would suppose, ill-fitted for the task, being unsociable, ill-educated, and latterly quite deaf. Again, Mr Bridge says that Watteau and the Impressionists reflected respectively the social and artistic decay of their periods. Yet I would hesitate to say that either was less inspired than Cimabue. And what of Cézanne, the last perhaps of the great artists to interest himself in Nature's appearance?

Whence comes the inspiration of the artist? From his inner self? From God? From his environment—natural, social, and artistic? Personally I think all must contribute. If, as I believe, God is the truth of art, then its language is that of shapes, colours, and lines. Painters do indeed use natural objects—some to a greater, some to a lesser, extent; they also inevitably reflect the spirit of their periods. But these are not the properties that distinguish the arts from other fields of human endeavour. If any of the arts is to succeed in its own field it must attain a certain aesthetic level, for herein lies its power to transmit its truth beyond the limits of epoch and geography. The more superficial references of a poem or a painting may in time be lost, but its beauty endures. All art may be appreciated, sometimes with difficulty, for its own truth—or rather for God's truth.

The basis of a good painting is good design, and the best of modern artists have been at pains to reaffirm this point. The next step—a deeper and surer spiritual vision. In this, social creeds have notably failed. It is now the turn of the Church.

Yours faithfully,
ROBERT LORY.

LONDON, N.W.3.

SECT OR CHURCH?

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

The crux of Mr Browning's total misinterpretation of my book—for so I must regard his article "Sect or Church?" in your January number—is his failure to heed my warning, given in Chapter 4 and maintained throughout, that the "Remnant" is an *organic and not a numerical* concept; which is itself a fundamental distinction between what is of the Church and what is sectarian. "Churchmanship" depends not on numbers—large or small—but on sacraments, worship, doctrine and loyalty. Few, if any, of the basic characteristics of the Remnant are applicable to what are usually called "the sects"; whereas they are all applicable, to a far greater degree, to, say, the Order of St Benedict. Are the Benedictines there-

fore a "sect"? They assuredly put prayer and worship before direct evangelism while their evangelistic influence is incalculable; which is the whole point.

To put it another way, I think Mr Browning fails to distinguish between "the Remnant concept of pastoral theology" and the "Remnant" at its heart, which is analogous to confusing the British Constitution with the House of Commons. I can quite see that if you imagine a single parish Remnant torn from its context and planted in a nightmare with a maladroit priest in charge, it might look a little like a "sect". If we throw in apostasy as well it would have become one, but then the only bearing it would have on my book would be as a somewhat extreme example of the "exclusive élite" or "nice little nucleus" approach which (Chapter 3 *passim*) I condemn as firmly as Mr Browning could possibly wish.

I submit with apology to a more general criticism that some parts of my book could have been more clearly expressed, and I acknowledge misrepresentation as but one of the natural hazards an author must risk; but on the off-chance that this discussion might incite someone to read the book, I would like to make three general points. The first is that however badly I have failed I have tried to write down what I mean; it seems a curious method of criticism that takes the line that, although a book clearly says something, one naturally assumes that "in spirit" it means the opposite. Secondly, I think it illogical to deduce that whatever is refused absolute top priority (which place I reserve unashamedly for the Adoration of God) is thereby rejected altogether. If the book really teaches a total lack of concern, care, compassion or love for any but the devout few, then why has it five chapters (12–16) on the ascetics of sub-Christian and Natural religion? With whatever little success, why should I devote nearly a quarter of the book in trying to help those on the fringes of Church life, or outside it altogether, if I have no interest in them? Thirdly, I do not necessarily reject or scorn all the subjects with which the book does not deal; there are several excellent works on preaching, for example, to which I have nothing original to add: let us at least be unanimous in that whatever the shortcomings of my own book it is certainly long enough. Under this heading, Mr Browning suggests that, to me, Church membership depends upon certain obligations rather than on Baptism; although I hold no such view I think I am really guilty of ambiguity on this point, and I am grateful to him for pointing it out.

Finally, might I add my contribution to your interesting collection of nightmares: it is that unless we soon produce some vital and creative system of pastoral theology—of the Remnant or anything else—in place of the present devout and energetic chaos, then we will have no parish priests at all. But let us all be consoled in that the inevitable end of a nightmare is to wake up and find it is not true.

Yours sincerely,

MARTIN THORNTON, O.G.S.

COPPENHALL ST MICHAEL RECTORY,
CREWE.

INTINCTION

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Those who are opposed to any change in administering the chalice adopt that attitude either because they believe that the metal of which the cup is made, or the alcohol in the wine, is a sterilizing agent, or because they believe that the cup is disinfected supernaturally. The latter seems to be the opinion of the majority of the advocates of the traditional method of administration. They consider that normal health precautions are, in the circumstances, irreverent. However, they are not all free from the inconsistency which seems to characterize human beings wherever they are to be found, because many of them have no objection to the hygienic precautions of clean linen, lavabo and, more particularly, the use of the purificator. We need to reaffirm that there ought not to be antagonism between Religion and Science. The shocked conservative attitude towards the suggestion that an alternative method of administration of the chalice should be allowed, is an unconscious relic of the obscurantist opposition of the Church to Science.

The dislike of the common chalice may well be more general than many suppose. When I sought to discover, by means of a plebiscite, the disposition of the twenty-nine members of a country church, to which I was privileged to minister, towards the common chalice, it transpired that seventeen would welcome intinction, and twelve favoured the traditional method.

Until the alternative form of intinction is authorized, men of goodwill will be precluded from coming to the Lord's Table. We crave the sympathy of the bishops on their behalf, and believe that this is a matter of such urgency that our much vaunted slow procedure method of conserving the truth of the Church should, in this instance, be waived. To be a child of the twentieth century is not, after all, a sin worthy of virtual excommunication.

Yours sincerely,
DEWI W. THOMAS.

THE VICARAGE,
LLANFIHANGEL GENAU'R GLYN,
CARDS.

OFFERTORY AN OBLATION

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

In your January number, Brother George Every renewed his interesting discussion of the meaning of the Prayer for the Whole State of Christ's Church. He dissuades us from believing that there is an organic relation between this prayer and the offertory. He concludes, "At any rate the prayer in its present position is part of the

antecommunion, and in that context we must look for its meaning". Is this not the old view that the liturgy can best be understood in fragments, rather than in its unified fulfilment?

It is well to remember that the pre-tractarian Sunday service and the medieval high mass were both essentially the same thing—a eucharistic liturgy emasculated by the absence of lay communions. The medieval Church, always fearful of criticism, tried to smooth over a bad situation; our reformers uncompromisingly made the incompleteness of antecommunion quite evident. This is not to say antecommunion is worthless; the Prayer for the Church, the lections, the Creed, the preceding Litany all do have meaning here. But, as channels of normal Sunday worship, these all have *more meaning* when the liturgy is carried through to its rightful completion.

The Prayer for the Church does raise a challenge. We are to-day accustomed to a Christian community that is divided both ecclesiastically and sociologically. We have thus forgotten that a primary purpose of Sunday worship is precisely the gathering together of the people of God into one body, even the Body of Christ. *This stands at the very heart of what the eucharist is.* Justin Martyr, Hippolytus, and Serapion saw this plainly; so did Cranmer and Jeremy Taylor. So far from being an inconsequential preliminary, the Prayer for the Church expresses a fundamental purpose of the whole rite: the building up of Christ's people into a holy commonwealth. The gathering of money, or the ancient gathering of loaves, is a closely related ceremonial action. (Admittedly its significance is more evident in those parts of the Anglican Communion where the work of the Church is mainly supported by the Sunday offerings.)

Different ages have had different insights. The 1662 revisers made certain contributions, as have others. Our worship has undergone many modifications, both before and after the Reformation. The whole of our liturgy (or of any other historic rite) cannot be accounted for on the basis of the conscious intentions of any one reviser or group of revisers. Nor, for that matter, can we hope to understand the lofty sacramental mysticism of Thomas Cranmer if we are only interested (as so many contemporary Anglicans seem to be) in arguing over Catholic-Protestant tensions. Jungmann, Dix, and Dowden are certainly useful, but the student of our Prayer Book must return again and again, as Cranmer himself evidently did, to St Augustine's *de civitate,* x, 6.

Yours sincerely,
H. B. Porter.

Nashotah House,
Nashotah,
Wisconsin.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE FORMATION OF CHRISTIAN DOGMA. By Martin Werner. A. and C. Black. 30s.

Here and there among the theological professors of Europe is to be found one who not only accepts and teaches a radically critical view of the New Testament documents themselves (as does Dr Rudolf Bultmann), but carries this radical liberalism into the realm of Christian dogmatics, thereby coming into collision with that whole revived "biblical theology" of which Dr Karl Barth will always be a symbol. Such a teacher is Dr Martin Werner, Professor of Theology at Berne. In 1941 he wrote a massive work, *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas*, in which he set out his particular reconstruction of the early history of Christian doctrine. This book, considerably pruned of historical data, but enlarged by a chapter on the later historical significance of the transformation of doctrine in the early centuries of the Church, has been translated by Dr S. G. F. Brandon of Manchester. Its publication is bound to release a vigorous discussion of the old subject (recalling the days of Edwin Hatch, Adolf Harnack and others), viz. how far the catholicism of the fourth and fifth centuries can be regarded as truly continuous with the religion of the New Testament.

First, Werner's thesis must be objectively summarized. He begins by accepting, with little or no reserve, the view of the earliest years of Christianity known as "consistently eschatological". This is the viewpoint (in Werner's words) "of that sense of eschatological expectancy, current in late-Jewish apocalyptic which dominated the whole of Primitive Christianity". Any conception of realized eschatology is rejected in favour of a mainly futurist expectation of the Parousia. This, according to Werner, was an inescapable corollary of belief in the resurrection of Jesus. "The Lord's Day", the day of his resurrection was but a variant of "the day of the Lord". "The Lord's supper" was but an anticipation of the Messianic banquet. St Paul's words in Galatians 6 about the Cross—"whereby the world is crucified unto me and I unto the world"—were meant quite literally. The old aeon had stopped when Christ died. The new aeon had begun. The apparent continuation of the world's history was an insignificant "hangover", shortly to be brought to an abrupt end, like a dream, by the Parousia and the general resurrection.

Continuing Werner's thesis, the next step is the crisis brought about in the Church's life and thought by the delay in this expected *dénouement*. The question "where is the promise of his coming?" (2 Pet. 3. 4) is not a provincial problem of a near-heretical group, but the dominating concern of successive generations of Christians. The transition from Primitive Christianity to patristic catholicism is the inevitable result of their adjustment to the new situation—"this year, next year, sometime, never" seemed to be the pattern imposed on them by the delay, and their doctrine and outlook had to be drastically readjusted accordingly.

Werner then proceeds to examine the transformation of successive aspects of Christian doctrine under the impact of the changed eschatological picture. In Christology there was, on his view, a gradual leaving behind of the Son of Man imagery, which was indistinguishable from an "angel-Christology", and a transition to the thought of a Divine Son of God, "of one substance with the Father". To Werner, Arianism was not a threat from an alien type of thought, but the last desperate attempt to retain a much more primitive type of Christology. Redemption, which had at first meant deliverance from the principalities and powers of the present world order, by union with their conqueror, became deliverance from human mortality through the promise of eternal life guaranteed by baptism. The warrior contending with the powers of this world gave way to the Logos, animating "a tame universe". The Eucharist, no longer the anticipation of a Messianic banquet, soon to be enjoyed, became the occasion when "the medicine of immortality" could be received. This sacramental "essence" was thought of very literally as having flowed from the wounded side of Christ on the Cross.

The final chapter on "the historical meaning of de-eschatologization" works out Werner's thesis as to the further results of the Church's ambiguous and apparently unsuccessful effort to adjust herself to the new situation. He says that "at the turn of the fourth century, there was ushered in a period of unrestrained and increasing theological mendacity", and to this he traces every subsequent failure of historic Christianity to grapple with the successive spiritual problems of every age, down to our own.

It would require a book as long as Dr Werner's to deal critically with all that he has to say. Perhaps Prof. H. E. W. Turner's *Pattern of Christian Truth* is itself the best modern answer easily available, and it is significant that Dr Turner, who had the German version of the book available to him, devotes several pages to a critique of Werner, following on a critique of the more usual "Hellenization thesis" as represented by Adolf Harnack. Turner holds that while a rigid orthodoxy from which heretics diverged cannot be substantiated, there was nevertheless a *continuum* of thought, piety and prayer which found its natural crystallization in the Nicene and Chalcedonian statements.

It only remains to mention some reflections which arise after studying a book of this sort.

Let it be said at once that there *is* a problem to be solved when the piety and doctrinal formulations of the fourth and fifth centuries are put alongside their counterparts in the New Testament period. A changed future perspective, a new Hellenistic environment, the results of prolonged trial and error in theological expression, and the inevitable working out of rational and logical deductions from agreed data—all these may well have played their part. The eschatological development may have been an important one—every preacher knows how in Advent he finds himself feeling for a form of words which will be loyal to the Bible and the Creed, but will avoid

the implications of a too literal apocalypticism. But can this one feature bear the weight of the entire process? I do not think so.

And are the premises of the whole fabric properly laid? Grant that the Marcan picture of our Lord is conceived entirely in terms of an eschatological crisis, can the same be said of Q? Did not the prophetic, as opposed to the apocalyptic, element in Christ's teaching necessitate a strongly *ethical* element from the very start, and is the whole picture of the new law in St Matthew to be detached from the historic Jesus, and dubbed as a mere adaptation to take the place of an apocalyptic warning? And even if the development Werner visualizes did in fact take place, even if it took place for the reasons he advances, is the whole thing to be put down to "theological mendacity"? At this point fundamental convictions tend to take control, even of a reviewer! If we cannot believe that the main development of the Church's thought and life in the formative centuries was guided by the Holy Spirit of Truth, our lot—especially that of a bishop—is not a happy one. This does not mean that the process of scholarly inquiry is at any point to be held up because of the possible inconvenience of what may be discovered. To do this would be an act of profound unbelief in God. But it does mean that much of the evidence will take on its own colour from the eye of the observer. Dr Werner himself repeatedly chooses between two possible interpretations of one piece of evidence, and is quite clearly influenced in his choice by the conclusions which he has already reached on other grounds. Objectivity in examining the facts, a willingness to follow where the argument leads, and a firm faith, nourished from the historic sources of Scripture, tradition and reason, are the best equipment for a study of a period which is certain to raise the most far-reaching problems.

RONALD LEICESTER.

FOR FAITH AND FREEDOM. Gifford Lectures in the University of Glasgow, Vol. II, Christian Theology. By Leonard Hodgson. Blackwell. 25s.

In his first series of Gifford Lectures, Prof. Hodgson concluded that "we can best make sense of 'the universe in general' by thinking of it as a process expressing *the will of a Creator to bring into existence a community of finite free persons*". In this second series his aim is to expound "the special form of natural theology, which is Christian theology, to try to show how the Christian interpretation of certain events in the history of the world fits in with, illuminates and carries further what understanding of the universe and of our lives we have already gained". The proper starting-point for this exposition and demonstration is not, he suggests, the apostolic *kerygma*, but that to which the apostolic *kerygma* bore witness.

"*Christ gave his life: it is for Christians to discern the doctrine.*" In discerning the doctrine, allowance must be made for the conditioning of the minds through which God wills to make himself known by the forms of thought and linguistic usage of their age and culture. "As we study the writings of the past," he says (and under this head he includes the books of the Bible "just as much as" the conciliar creeds, the patristic writings, and the works of scholastic and Reformation divines), "the question we have always to be asking is: '*What must the truth have been and be if men who thought and spoke as they did saw it and spoke of it like that?*'"

The three statements in italics are not so italicized in the book; but they are so often repeated, with minor variations in it as almost to achieve the status of canons of theological procedure. Theology must concern itself with the interaction of *categories* and *evidence*—"categories" in the sense of the presuppositions which condition a man's outlook, and "evidence" as the objective facts which he is seeking to understand (p. 26). One of the primary functions of theology is to strip off layers of misconceptions derived from unexamined categories—such, for example, as the assumption that there can be no internal differentiations in the unity of God; or that God must be relieved of responsibility for the existence of evil; or that the Church exists for the benefit of its members. "The transformation of our idea of God by the light of the revelation of Himself in Jesus Christ is, I believe, one of the growing-points of theology today" (p. 209). It is characteristic of Prof. Hodgson's thought that theology is capable of such growth; that the Holy Spirit is still leading us further into truth by taking the things of God and showing them unto us; that we should think of God more often as "standing on before us, calling us on to fuller knowledge, bidding us consider what revision of the categories inherited from all our forefathers is required by the evidence he is now providing" (p. 206). It may be that the masculine texture and boldness of his thought derives from a lifetime spent in "the interpermeating study of theology and philosophy". If so, it would go far to explain why so much contemporary theological writing, lacking this interpermeation, grows quickly stale and unprofitable.

While in no sense disposed to quarrel with the controlling idea of these lectures that it is God's will to create persons endowed with genuine freedom, it may still be permissible for us to ask whether the problems of freedom in a technological age do not deserve somewhat fuller treatment. It is not merely "the existentialist *angst*" which prompts such questions. The retreat from freedom in the contemporary world might be claimed as one piece of objective "evidence" which requires at least a minor revision of "categories".

G. H. G. Hewitt.

Sheffield.

PUBLIC WORSHIP. By J. A. Jungmann, S.J. Translated by Clifford Howell, S.J. Challoner Publications. 21s.

WORSHIP AND THE MODERN CHILD. By John G. Williams. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

The first of these books is "an attempt to deal with the whole Liturgy of the Church within the compass of one small book of less than three hundred pages". Only a scholar of Dr Jungmann's eminence could attempt such an enterprise, and he does so with competence and distinction. He deals not only with the Mass, but also with the rites of the other Sacraments, together with the Divine Office, the Calendar and the building and adornment of churches. The whole field is covered; and, although one is left a little breathless at times, and although in places the treatment is a little thin, a real conspectus of the whole subject is presented. As an introduction to a living study of Liturgy the book could hardly be bettered. It is a book which should certainly be put into the hands of theological students; for it cannot fail to arouse their interest in a subject which, when mishandled, can so easily degenerate into a form of antiquarianism.

Dr Jungmann deliberately abstains from giving references and from citing authorities for the views he expresses, except in the case of recent work by his own colleagues and pupils. Nor does he normally argue his views, but states them categorically in nearly every case. Only in a few instances does he set out divergent views, before deciding, nearly always very judiciously, between them. In a book which is intended as an introduction there is everything to be said for a plain survey of the subject as the author sees it, without supporting references or argument, if the beginner is to obtain a grasp of the whole field. But the inclusion of some references and of some argument will inevitably lead the beginner to believe that every statement in the book which is not so supported is generally accepted by liturgical scholars; whereas in very many cases, of course, this is not so.

In one or two places Dr Jungmann's desire to be succinct has caused him to be misleading. The treatment of the institution of the Eucharist on p. 90, for instance, makes no mention of the Lord's giving thanks either over the Bread or over the Cup, and fails to face the fact that the Lord apparently pronounced the "Words of Consecration" during, or even after, the distribution of the elements. Again, on pp. 85–7, in dealing with the question of Ordinations, the contrast between those to the minor orders and to the subdiaconate on the one hand and to the diaconate and the presbyterate on the other is sufficiently drawn. But the paragraph which deals with ordination to the episcopate gives such an allusive description of the rite, that it would be impossible for a beginner to understand that it was basically the same as for the presbyterate and the diaconate.

But these are minor imperfections, almost inevitable when an accomplished scholar puts his immense learning at the service of

novices. The book will lead many to pursue the subject further, and to pursue it on the right lines.

Mr Williams's book falls into two halves. The first four chapters deal with "the rationale of Worship and Prayer, without which our approach to 'practical difficulties' is liable to be superficial and ineffective". The remaining nine chapters deal with the practical problems inherent in the training of individual children and in the organization of children's work in a parish. The second half of the book, though it says nothing very new, says all the right things, and says them very well. Perhaps a less compliant attitude might have been taken towards Indiscriminate Baptism. This part of the book should be of the greatest assistance to the younger clergy and to all who are concerned with such work. The first half of the book is less happy. The author, like most of us, obviously finds ascetic theology more difficult to expound than pastoralia. But this should not deter anyone from reading the book and profiting largely by it.

A. H. Couratin.

St Stephen's House,
Oxford.

The Burning Bush. Studies in Scottish Church History. By G. D. Henderson. St Andrew Press. 30s.

These studies in Scottish Church history consist of a collection of papers or essays, most of which have already appeared in print during the course of the past twenty years. The author, who was Professor of Church History in the University of Aberdeen, and Moderator of the General Assembly in 1955, imparts the fruits of his great learning without attempting to indulge in any fireworks or polemics.

The book takes its title from the opening essay, which explains how the Church of Scotland came to adopt as its crest the emblem of the burning bush with its motto "Nec tamen consumebatur".

The three essays that immediately follow are entitled: "Scots Confession, 1560", "The Exercise" and "The idea of the Covenant in Scotland". These may well prove somewhat bewildering to any who suppose that the Reformation Movement in Scotland followed a course similar to that in England.

But if the book serves to reveal to its readers the extent of their ignorance, and prompts them to further inquiry into the tangled story of the Scottish Church, it will help them to appreciate the background of the *Report of Relations between Anglican and Presbyterian Churches* which has recently been the subject of premature debate north of the Tweed.

The next three essays relate to episcopalian clergy in Aberdeen and district, then the stronghold of the episcopal party in the Church of Scotland. The first of these gives a sympathetic account of "the Aberdeen Doctors", of whom John Forbes of Corse, Professor of Divinity at King's College, was the most distinguished. This remarkable group of Scottish churchmen stood out stoutly against the

National Covenant of 1638 and resolutely refused to shout with the largest crowd. They belonged to the school of thought of which Archbishop Robert Leighton, saint, author and peacemaker, was so conspicuous an ornament. Of them Dr Henderson states that "the path pioneered by the Aberdeen Doctors has not in fact led anywhere, any more than did that of Leighton's 'Accommodation' or the Lambeth Appeal of 1920". But at least these advocates of Christian unity cast their bread upon the waters and, pray God, may yet find it after many days.

The remaining essays include an interesting one on "Puritanism in Eighteenth-century Scotland". Another, entitled "Religion and democracy in Scottish History", gives readers an insight into what has been one of the characteristic features of Scottish Presbyterianism, namely its refusal to tolerate interference on the part of the State in matters of religion. As Dr Henderson says: "Liberty was one of the prominent aims of that many-sided movement which we call the Reformation." John Knox in the sixteenth century made clear to Mary Queen of Scots his conviction that a monarch who proves unworthy may be deposed. The Great Rebellion in the seventeenth century broke out when Charles I tried to impose on Scotland a Prayer Book by exercise of his Royal authority. In the eighteenth century the restoration of private patronage in 1712 outraged the democratic feelings of the Scottish Evangelicals, and, as John Buchan says, "the dragon's teeth were sown which were to produce a melancholy harvest". That harvest was reaped at the Disruption in 1843, when Thomas Chalmers (who forms the subject of one of these essays) and over four hundred other ministers left the Church of Scotland and founded the Free Church. This principle of freedom from secular control was finally vindicated when in 1929 the reunited Church of Scotland "asserted in the most emphatic terms the separate and independent government and jurisdiction of the Church —the crucial test of autonomy". Dr Henderson himself suggests that the Church of Scotland might have retained the episcopate to this day had not the Stuart kings behaved with such meddlesome stupidity. As it is, the Scottish Episcopal Church still survives, representing the faithful remnant of the episcopalian party who suffered the penalty of their adherence to the Jacobite cause.

Several of the concluding essays, such as "The Priesthood of Believers", "The Witness of the Laity" and "Scotland's Contribution to Unity", touch on living issues of present-day church life, common to all religious denominations.

The Burning Bush is a book that can be warmly recommended to all who are interested in the fascinating story of the Church in Scotland. It has appeared at an opportune moment when talk of unity is in the air, and it emphasizes the loss that Presbyterians and Episcopalians alike have suffered by the death of its distinguished author.

Alan C. Don.

The Deanery,
Westminster.

CRISIS IN COMMUNICATION. By Malcolm Boyd. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

An advertisement, put out recently by the Canadian Broadcasting System, ran as follows:

NOBODY'S LISTENING BUT PEOPLE—ALL OF THEM STEADY EATERS

It's a slick reminder of the power of mass media, if we want to use them. But do we? On the one hand, there are Christians who believe that, if the Word of God is to be preached to the ends of the earth, according to our Lord's mandate, then we cannot possibly afford to ignore the Press and the Cinema, the Radio and Television. On the other hand, there are Christians who are very suspicious of these devices. What really is the effectiveness, they ask, of a Radio sermon, listened to by isolated individuals out of contact with a worshipping fellowship? The diehards of this group appear sincerely to believe that the life of Christ, expressed liturgically and pastorally, is still sufficient witness in the modern world. They feel that a medium like Television may try to use God as just another miracle product.

Malcolm Boyd seeks to reconcile these two points of view. He recognizes that the Church has both to use present-day techniques and also to stand in judgment upon them. He sees our task as being not to "exploit" the Television industry or the Press for Christ, but rather to help Television to be Television, the Press to be the Press in terms of the will of God for each. He warns us against taking too narrow a view of religion. We need to be identified with "the wrestling with evil that is going on in the deeper culture of our time".

On the subject of specific religious items, he says there is a startling lack of fresh creative thinking in this field; and that, though we may be trying to reach outside the fold, *by the nature of our presentation* we are often limiting our audience to members of the faithful core. This is a criticism which in Television we must certainly take to heart. We not only need to draw upon the very best professional know-how. We need also to re-examine our vocabulary. George MacLeod is reported as saying: "That young man on I.T.A. wouldn't let me use the word 'Incarnation.'" And the young man was right. There is a simple rule to be followed here. When we come to Mystery, let us admit it is Mystery; but when we *are* claiming to explain something, let us make absolutely sure that we are doing just that.

To all who work in these media Mr Boyd puts the question: What are your real motives? And he issues this warning in the words of Karl Barth: "A man may be of value to another man, not because he wishes to be important, not because he possesses some inner wealth of soul, not because of something he is, but because of what he is . . . not. The importance of an apostle is negative rather than positive. In him a void becomes visible. And for this reason he is able to share grace with others."

But, with these important provisos, there is no doubt in the author's mind that Christians should be "in the forefront of the

hottest battle". And anyone who has watched Father Huddleston or Bishop Bloom in action on Television will know this to be true. After all, although we are dealing with *mass* media, it simplifies down in the end to a personal encounter. We agree that it can only be a beginning, and the encounter must lead to other things. But in the long history of the Church such encounters have always been the first step towards conversion.

It is a pity that Mr Boyd's style of writing is so ponderous, for he deals with vital issues.

OLIVER HUNKIN.

LONDON.

POOR MONKEY. (The Child in Literature.) By Peter Coveney. Rockliff. 30s.

See how Shirley Temple, "Mandy", "Junior", and all the others stretch out their tender hands from the screen and wring tears from the stony-hearted! When did this process begin? It was fully developed by the time the flinty Lord Jeffrey (of the *Edinburgh Review*), who would not suffer Lake fools gladly, wept openly at his desk over Little Nell, and wrote anxiously to Dickens before he went to press in the hopes of averting the death of (was it?) Paul Dombey. Poor Dickens: he was as much to blame as anyone, because he wrote so well (when he wasn't writing badly). But no doubt it would have happened without him. And one suspects that the disease spread after his day from the upper and middle to the lower classes by means of that carrier, the Sunday school movement (whose compartmentalizing and sentimentalizing powers may have done more harm to the Church than all the Bishop Wilberforces and Mrs Trimmers put together).

Mr Coveney has written a very good book about this. It might have been a very bad book; for you don't know on which shelf to put a book of this sort—is it Literary Criticism, or Social History, or Theory of Education, or Child Psychology, or History of Ideas? But he has taken the theme of the Child and shown its literary development from Rousseau to D. H. Lawrence; and in the course of it he performs some very acute literary criticism—the chapter on Henry James is excellent and he is wise and balanced on Virginia Woolf and Lawrence. He also takes us to the medical laboratory and shows us some monstrous births pickled in saline—Drévetière or Janeway in the eighteenth century, Mrs Henry Wood and Marie Corelli in the nineteenth, J. M. Barrie and Forrest Reid in the twentieth. His long chapter on Dickens is perceptive and enthusiastic; though I think, while he admits the sentimentalism there, he understresses the element of sheer falsity in some of Dickens's child-characterization. (It isn't that Dickens is here the "eternal child", fixed so; but that he reads back his adult valuations and self-pityings into the child-state.) George Eliot proves least amenable to this book's approach: seldom has a very great novelist been weaker in delinea-

tion of children. Which shows that for some novelists the child-theme is but peripheral.

When he comes to Freud's influence, Mr Coveney asks (by implication) some severe and important questions of the theologian. Freud, he says, helped to emancipate us, and the novelist, from both "original sin" and "original innocence"—and I think he is right in regarding this as a valuable achievement, at any rate as "original sin" was concretely conceived in Victorian puritanism. (The question he implies is: "How will you Christians concretely conceive it now, if you are going to cling to the concept at all?") But he does intriguingly point out that the hostile reception of Freud's "infantile sexuality" theory was due to a defence-mechanism: the attempt to defend a myth of infantile purity which had taken the place of the lost Christian beliefs—a myth which went ill with the actual practice of child-repression. Indeed, there are suggestive analyses or comparisons scattered throughout the book. And it is encouraging to find one's hunch, that Coleridge was the greatest and most perceptive mind of the nineteenth century, confirmed by a quotation that was new, at least, to me. S. T. C. is comparing (in *The Friend*) the repressive with the "educing" methods of education:

> "Touch a door a little ajar, or half-open, and it will yield to the push of your finger. Fire a cannon-ball at it, and the door stirs not an inch: you make a hole through it, the door is spoilt for ever, but not *moved*. Apply this moral to Education."

M. Jarrett-Kerr, C.R.

Johannesburg.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Celebrant and Ministers of the Eucharist. By R. C. Mortimer, Bishop of Exeter. Mowbray. 4s. 6d.

The Poetry of the Eucharist. By F. J. E. Raby. Mowbray. 4s. 6d.

These occasional papers are the first in a new series of "Studies in Eucharistic Faith and Practice" under the general editorship of Dr F. L. Cross. Both are packed with information, but so tight that the general reader may have difficulty in grasping the outline, while the student of the subject wonders whether he is complaining of the omission of the obvious. The Bishop of Exeter is working, in most of his paper, over very well-ploughed ground. He cites Tertullian on heretics who hold office by rotation, but not the well-known passage in the *Liber de exhortatione castitatis* (c. 7) on the priesthood of all the baptized and lay celebration in emergencies, nor does he notice stories of children who played at liturgies with striking consequences. These do not affect any conclusions as to the Church's rules, but they do underline a difference between the *non potest* of the Fourth Lateran in 1215 and the *Placuit minime fieri debere* of the Council of Arles in 314.

When he comes to the secondary subject of concelebration the

Bishop wishes to confine "the strict sense of the word" to "an actual consecration of the same oblations by more than one person". What is commonly called concelebration in the Eastern churches, *concelebratio caeremonialis* by Western liturgists, he calls "the comparatively modern rite of the Eastern Church", and then in the same paragraph, finds it in Hippolytus. He may mean that it fell into disuse and was revived before the time of Morin, in the middle of the seventeenth century, but he cites no evidence, and he may only mean that the ritual is modern in detail. He allows that "the bulk of the evidence for concelebration in the strict sense comes from Rome" and the Roman rite at ordinations. Some of his Roman, and much of his other evidence, could be interpreted as referring to concelebration in that wider sense of the term, often extended, even by Western liturgists in the Middle Ages, to cover all forms of ceremonial participation by priests, deacons, and laymen, in the order and action of the eucharist. The Bishop gives an account of objections from the scholastic standpoint, "probably responsible for the restriction of the practice of concelebration to the ordination rite". "The dilemma is plain. Either the bishop finishes before the newly ordained, and they consecrate nothing. Or the bishop finishes last, and he, the principal celebrant, consecrates nothing." Most Anglicans will sympathize with the "scarcely concealed impatience" of Pope Benedict XIV; many would probably prefer the more universal and flexible form of concelebration to the ritual drill of a Roman ordination.

Dr Raby is the acknowledged master of one part of his subject, the poetical ornaments added to the Roman liturgy in the Middle Ages. He does not discuss the Gallican metrical mass in the missal of Reichenau, nor attempt to consider Greek and Eastern anaphoras as poetical compositions. He does tell us something of the relation, not only of the Kontakion, but of the sequence, to Syrian rhythmical homilies, the primary source of so much liturgical poetry. But if matter of this kind is to have any real influence on modern problems of selection and revision something more in the way of comparison must be attempted. The few paragraphs on eucharistic poetry in the medieval vernaculars and in modern languages are too brief to help, and in English Dr Raby has missed not only R. S. Hawker, that rock in the Victorian garden, but *Taliessin at Lancelot's Mass*, by Charles Williams, the most exciting of modern English eucharistic poems, which is also a vision of lay celebration in a perspective of expectation more common in Eastern liturgical poetry than in Latin.

George Every, S.S.M.

Kelham.

God's Business. By Edward Rogers. Epworth Press. 7s. 6d.

The sub-title of this book is a useful reminder of the fact that is too often forgotten, that there is a relationship between economics and theology. Mr Rogers is a trained economist who believes that although there is no "Christian economics" there is a field in which they overlap. The book is written apparently for laymen, but there

is a suggestion that theologians should pay more attention to the *economic* fallacies of Marxism. The style is at times irritating and much in the book has been said before. Nevertheless, there is much value in a statement from an economist who takes it for granted that the great Christian dogmas have a relevance to such things as work, money and automation. Theology, he says, speaks convincingly only when it serves the Lord of all Life in the dust of the world he came to redeem.

HELENA CHARLES.

LONDON.

THE TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By Ernst Wurthwein. Translated by P. R. Ackroyd. With 41 plates. Blackwell. 17s. 6d.

This is an excellent introduction to the Hebrew Bible in general and in particular to Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, third and subsequent editions. It has been very competently translated by Dr Ackroyd, and we are grateful to him for making available to students in the English-speaking countries a book which had already proved its worth in German. Professor Wurthwein provides in a compact but easily assimilable form the kind of information which the student needs before he can use *Biblia Hebraica* (or any Hebrew text) intelligently.

The plates are not quite as clear in the English edition, nor has the binding provided for the double-page plate (No. 15) as competently as did the German. No. 20 (*Codex Leningradensis*) exhibits a different passage, no doubt for some good reason; but No. 22 displays a page of the first Rabbinic Bible, which gives a less valuable impression of such a Bible than did the original plate of Buxtorf's Bible. On the other hand, the English gives an extra plate (No. 41) which very usefully reproduces a page of the Complutensian Polyglot.

The work discusses matters of script and writing materials, the origin and character of the Masoretic Text, the nature and value of the versions, and offers a very valuable introduction to the science of textual criticism. The sigla of BH^3 are reproduced as the relevant matter is discussed, and an index of sigla is provided, so that Wurthwein's work is a veritable *vade mecum* for Kittel's edition of the Bible. The author has taken the opportunity provided by the English edition to bring the bibliography and literature references up to date.

This is a book which all students of the Hebrew text, whether they are beginners or experts, will be very glad to have on their desks.

S. B. FROST.

MCGILL UNIVERSITY,
MONTREAL.

MARGARET. By James Davidson Ross. Hodder and Stoughton. 12s. 6d.

This is the story of the last few months of the life of Margaret, who at the age of fifteen died of cancer. It is also the story of the

faith with which she accepted her suffering and the astonishing effect this faith had on all around her. Those who try to minister to others in their suffering will certainly be helped by this book. It gives no facile answer: there was no spiritual healing in the generally accepted sense; but step by step we are shown the answer that was found in the experience of Margaret and those who loved her. This kind of testimony, which has an obvious respect for truth, and which does not try to "rush anyone", but simply lays before us the experience of ordinary people is rare and is as refreshing as water on thirsty ground.

MARGARET KANE.

MALTBY.

GOLGOTHA AND THE CHURCH OF THE HOLY SEPULCHRE. By André Parrot. (Studies in Biblical Archaeology.) S.C.M. Press. 10s. 6d.

Prof. Parrot, one of the most eminent of French archaeologists, gives us a clear and readable summary of the evidence to be examined in deciding whether the traditional sites of Golgotha and the sepulchre of our Lord are authentic. He shows convincingly that there is little doubt that tradition is right concerning the site of the sepulchre, although the tomb itself has been completely destroyed. As regards the site of the crucifixion, he demonstrates that the traditional site conflicts with none of the evidence, literary or archaeological, but we should like to have had more discussion of the positive evidence for its authenticity. Granted that our Lord's sepulchre was near the place of crucifixion, it seems rather too convenient that the two sites were close enough to be covered by one church. There is some confusion also in the use of the name "Golgotha". Sometimes it means a district containing both sites; sometimes it means the actual site of the cross.

M. Parrot dismisses the common allegation that the early Christian community would have had no interest in the places associated with events in our Lord's passion, and he shows that the location of the sepulchre could be remembered through the centuries, even when built upon.

There is an interesting long appendix on tombs and burials in ancient Jerusalem, which could be read with profit by Bible illustrators and those responsible for "Easter Gardens".

A few blemishes spoil an admirable little book. Plate 4 has lost its title in the reviewer's copy. Plates 8 and 9 could be much clearer. On p. 110 there is some careless printing of Greek.

ALAN ROGERS.

KOLEJY S. PAOLY,
AMBATOHARANANA,
MADAGASCAR.

GOD AND US. By Jean Daniélou. Translated by Walter Roberts. Mowbray. 22s. 6d.

Those who have had to endure French cooking know how soon one tires of a succession of small, tasty dishes, and how one longs for a solid English meal. Fr Daniélou has served us up a typical meal

à la française: a sequence of tid-bits for the gourmet leading in orderly fashion from soup to dessert. This English reader would like to make a good meal off some of the subjects dealt with in this book, but only a morsel of each is offered, and we are quickly hurried on to the next course. The whole meal is over in a mere 200 pages, and many of the courses have had less than justice done to them: the similarities and differences between Christian and pagan mysticism occupy three paragraphs; in a discussion on Justification, Luther is dismissed in one short sentence; and the important matter of Original Sin, so relevant to the subject-matter of the book, is merely mentioned. But it would be unfair to suggest that *all* the topics raised are only summarily dealt with: some are very fully discussed, particularly the limitations of philosophy, and the personality of God; but the overwhelming impression is that too much has been compressed into a small book.

Yet it does bring us face to face with issues of supreme importance. Its theme is the revelation God has made of himself to man. God has revealed himself in non-biblical religion (in the works of creation and in the moral conscience); to the minds of philosophers; in the history of Israel; in the Person of Jesus Christ; in the work of the Church; and to the soul in prayer and in its life in the spirit. This scheme is a logical sequence which might, *inter alia*, "help those who are groping after God": but it is also an artificial sequence, for these are not the inquiries of one who is searching for God, but the analysis of one who has been found by him. The Christian starts with his experience of God in prayer and in the life of Grace, and as a member of the Church, and from that standpoint studies the possibility of other revelations of God; and conversion is more commonly occasioned by an encounter with God in prayer or in moral crisis, or in the life of the Church, than by the logical sequence presented in this book.

Useful bibliographies and footnotes will give the hungry student an opportunity of finding fuller treatment of many subjects touched on.

Alan Rogers.

Ambatoharanana,
Madagascar.

Martin Luther: Road to Reformation. By Heinrich Boehmer. Thames and Hudson. 12s. 6d.

The scope covered by this reasonably priced book is the life of Luther until he was seized and safeguarded in the Wartburg. It is natural to make some comparison with another cheap edition of the life of Luther, namely Bainton's *Here I Stand*. Boehmer devotes about two and a half times as much space to Luther's life and circumstances up to the Wartburg episode as does Bainton. His style is interesting and the material is well put together. There is abundant detail; two examples may be cited: he discusses all the duties of a professor, such as Luther was in the Augustinian Order, and the history of Indulgences.

The blurb claims that the genius of Luther emerges as much as possible from his own words. It does not, however, appear that this claim is very valid; for example, in the chapter entitled "Against the Foundations of Medievalism", Luther's three famous works, "The Open Letter to the Christian Nobility", "The Babylonian Captivity", "Freedom of the Christian Man", are discussed. While abundant space is given to them there is very little direct quotation, although there is a good deal of paraphrase and précis. The author has, however, made plain that what Luther wrote at this period struck at the very foundations of Roman power and medieval religion.

The book does not pretend to be a work of deep scholarship, but may be warmly commended to one who wants to read a biography of a great man.

H. F. Woodhouse.

The Anglican Theological College,
Vancouver, B.C.

When Christ Comes and Comes Again. By T. F. Torrance. Hodder and Stoughton. 12s. 6d.

This book consists of sixteen sermons rewritten "in order to bring out more fully the theological content of evangelism". The author is a well-known Presbyterian theologian, and he expresses the basic elements of the Christian faith in a straightforward and vigorous manner which should prove helpful to the clergyman needing material for his Sunday sermons and to the well-educated churchgoer. I thought the chapter on "The Violence of the Kingdom" particularly good. But I am astonished that Prof. James Stewart should hail this work, in a publisher's blurb, as a significant contribution to the problem of evangelistic method. Of course, things are different in Scotland, but I find it hard to believe that even there the average man in the street could make much of these addresses which throughout assume a profound knowledge of the Bible and of religious language. Prof. Torrance's Barthian presuppositions do not allow him to make any concessions to the questions or even to the background of modern secular man, and I cannot help feeling that he is, for once, out of his depth.

R. F. Hettlinger.

St Augustine's College,
Canterbury.

Chichester Cathedral: its history and art. By W. K. Lowther Clarke. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

The Stained Glass Windows of Canterbury Cathedral. By Bernard Rackham. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

Dr Lowther Clarke describes his attractively produced and illustrated book as an experiment. "It is not meant to compete with the ordinary guides or histories, but rather to supplement them, and in particular to provide material for teachers who bring their pupils to

the Cathedral and would like to explain its meaning." It deals with the architecture, the history, and the art of the Cathedral, and is admirably contrived for its purpose. We should not be surprised if it leads to the production of similar books about other Cathedrals, for the practice of bringing parties of young people and others to visit them is constantly increasing, and needs to be used to the best possible effect.

Mr Rackham's detailed guide to the windows of Canterbury Cathedral should prove invaluable to visitors who can take time to study them closely.

A. R. V.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

GEOFFREY BLES: Lord Elton, *Edward King and our Times* (12s. 6d.).

BROWNE AND NOLAN (DUBLIN): Dom Mark Tierney, O.S.B., *Holy Week* [a commentary on the new Roman Catholic ceremonies for Holy Week] (5s.).

CENTRAL LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY (FREMONT, NEBRASKA): P. W. H. Frederick, *John Wyclif and the First English Bible* (75 cents).

CHURCH INFORMATION BOARD: Margaret Tilley, *Where Help Begins* [an essay on Counselling by a psychiatric social worker] (1s. 6d.).

COLLINS: Gerald Vann, O.P., and P. K. Meagher, O.P., *Stones or Bread?* [the three temptations of our Lord and their application to modern times] (12s. 6d.).

DELACHAUX ET NIESTLÉ (NEUCHÂTEL): Max Thurian, *La Confirmation: consécration des Laïcs* (Frs 4.50).

EPWORTH PRESS: Donald Soper, *It is Hard to Work for God* [five sermons based on F. W. Faber's hymn] (3s. 6d.).

FAITH PRESS: Stephen F. Bayne, *In the Sight of the Lord* [eight meditations for Lent] (6s.); Herbert Waddams (Ed.), *Anglo-Russian Theological Conference* (15s.).

HERBERT JENKINS: C. O. Rhodes, *The New Church in the New Age* (21s.).

LONGMANS: C. F. Whitley, *The Exilic Age* (16s.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: H. J. Kraus, *The People of God in the Old Testament* (2s. 6d.).

MACMILLAN: Dorothy Emmet, *Function, Purpose and Powers* (28s.).

PETER OWEN: Vergilius Ferm, *A Dictionary of Pastoral Psychology* (35s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: M. A. Thomas: *Meditations of an Indian Christian* (5s.); Alan Richardson, *Science and Existence*; Edwin Barker, *Scientific and Technological Education*; H. A. Warren, *Technical Education*; Monica Wingate, *Purpose in Teacher Training*, "Technics and Purpose" Series, 1–4 (2s. 6d. each).

SHEED AND WARD: Ronald A. Knox, *Let Dons Delight* [new edition: imaginary conversations at Oxford from 1588 to 1938] (12s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: H. H. Henson, *Ad Clerum* [reprint, with a new preface by the Archbishop of York] (9s. 6d.); Manasses, *Go in Peace* [an exposition of penitence and confession] (5s. 6d.); B. G. T. Sawbridge, *Good Tidings of Great Joy* [passages for meditation from the Bible, the B.C.P., and well-known English hymns] (10s. 6d.); T. F. Taylor, *A Profest Papist—Bishop John Gordon* (7s. 6d.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON

A COMMENTARY ON

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

C. S. C. WILLIAMS

Fellow of Merton College, Oxford

"This commentary by Mr Williams on the Acts of the Apostles is an admirable example of how the results of learned investigation can be assembled to show the complexity and variety of the problems set by a single book on the Bible; he also makes it possible to judge how far they have and have not been solved. English biblical scholarship mediating its methods and results to the general reader, is here seen at its best." A. R. VIDLER 25*s. net*

For publication in May

A COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE by A. R. C. LEANEY, *Lecturer in Christian Theology, University of Nottingham.* 25*s. net.*

Already published.

A COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS by C. K. BARRETT, D.D., *Senior Lecturer in Theology, University of Durham.* 25*s. net*

THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL

MARTIN NOTH, D.D.

Professor of Old Testament, University of Bonn

"A brilliant work, deep and penetrating, as well as lucid and illuminating, a happy blend of analysis and synthesis, balanced by a keen realisation of the inexplicable in history generally and in the history of ancient Israel especially. It is good to see this magnificent work accessible to English readers in this excellent translation (of the German edition) by Stanley Godman." MANCHESTER GUARDIAN 42*s. net*

PROPHETIC FAITH IN ISAIAH

SHELDON H. BLANK, D.D.

An exposition of the thought of the writers of Isaiah, and a discussion of the religions of the various prophets whose teaching is collected in the book. Dr Blank is concerned to demonstrate the faith they reveal, as a provocation to religious thinking today rather than as a chapter in the history of ancient religions. 18*s. net*

A LIBRARY OF MODERN RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

General Editor : HENRY CHADWICK

Reprinted writings of the greatest theological and historical interest from the last three centuries, each with important introductions.

KIERKEGAARD'S 'JOHANNES CLIMACUS.' Translated for the first time and edited with assessment by T. H. CROXALL, D.D. *May.* 15*s. net.*

JOHN LOCKE: THE REASONABLENESS OF CHRISTIANITY and A DISCOURSE ON MIRACLES. Edited and abridged by Professor I. T. RAMSEY. *May.* 12*s. 6d. net*

ADAM & CHARLES BLACK

HOW SHALL THEY HEAR?

GORDON W. IRESON — **9s. 6d. net**

"We are told in plain penetrating terms, that everywhere command assent, how to say what must be said, and is so mighty difficult to know how to say."
Theology

AD CLERUM

HERBERT HENSLEY HENSON — **9s. 6d. net**

Foreword by the Archbishop of York

"A book which a new generation of clergy should add to their libraries for frequent reference when they are in need either of a warning of the perils of their vocation or of its glory and power." *Church Times*

LECTURES ON PREACHING

PHILLIPS BROOKS — **9s. 6d. net**

Foreword by Dr J. R. H. Moorman

Few preachers of an older generation were not indebted to the great American bishop, and few preachers of the present generation can afford not to be indebted to him. Since the purpose of the *Priest's Library* is in part to re-issue books which should find a place on every clergyman's bookshelf, this was a 'must' for the series.